

## REMARKS

Prior to entry of this response, claims 1-26 are pending, with claims 1, 15 and 23 being independent claims.

### **Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-13, and 15-22 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(a)**

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-13, and 15-22 have been rejected as anticipated by Mann. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. With regards to claim 1, Mann fails to disclose the limitation of “entering information identifying the passenger a second time into a computer before departure....” Instead, Mann discloses that after an identification takes place, the passenger is checked in (col. 17, lines 9-14; Fig. 6). Mann does not state that *identifying information* is again entered into a computer for a second time. Applicant notes that the disclosure in Mann of scanning and verification of user identity (see col. 17, lines 14-20) is not “entering identifying information into a computer,” which is a separate action and is done only once at the start of the reservation process (col. 16, line 67 through col. 17, line 4).

With respect to claims 15-22, these claims have been cancelled, thereby mooted this rejection.

Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 1 is patentable and requests that the rejection under section 102(a) be withdrawn. Claims 2-3, and 5-9 and 12-13 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

### **Rejection of Claims 10, 11 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

These claims depend from independent claim 1. As Applicant has shown above, claim 1 is patentable, and therefore claims 10, 11 and 14 are patentable for at least the same reason. Therefore, these rejections are moot.

### **Rejection of Claims 23-24 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 23-24 as anticipated by Pugliese in view of Mann, in view of Sweatte further in view of Official Notice. Applicant respectfully traverses this

rejection. Again, Applicant maintains that this rejection appears to be improper because, for anticipation, every limitation of the claim must be disclosed in a single reference. In any event, the Examiner appears to be combining the references in order to reject the claims. However, the Examiner has not pointed to any suggestion in Pugliese that would cause one of ordinary skill to combine Pugliese with the other cited references. Specifically, the Examiner has failed to show why one would combine Pugliese, which provides no suggestion of checking gathered information for a second time with a computer concerning the passenger's identity and verifying the passenger's identity prior to departure, with Mann. Furthermore, and for the reasons provided with respect to claim 1 above, Mann in any event fails to supply this missing limitation. Having failed to carry this burden, the rejection based on this combination of references cannot be sustained. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn. Claim 24 depends from claim 23 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 23.

**Rejection of Claims 25-26 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

These claims depend from independent claim 23. As Applicants have shown above, claim 23 is patentable, and therefore claims 25-26 are patentable for at least the same reason. Therefore, these rejections are moot.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner would allow claim 4.

## SUMMARY

Pending Claims 1-14 and 23-26 as amended are patentable. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner grant early allowance of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorneys for the Applicant via telephone if such communication would expedite this application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Anastasia Heffner", written over a horizontal line.

Anastasia Heffner  
Registration No. 47,638  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200